REMARKS

Filed concurrently herewith is a One Month Extension of Time which extends the shortened statutory period for response to June 28, 2006. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Office Action dated February 28, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 1-3 have been canceled, claims 4 and 5 have been amended and new claim 9 has been added in order to better define that which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, claims 4-9 are presently pending in the instant application.

Referring now to the Office Action, independent claim 4 was rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and contend that the AAPA neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by the Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, AAPA does not disclose an oscillation circuit which generates a clock signal for data transmission upon receiving an operation-enable signal.

However, to expedite the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 4 has been amended to more clearly recite that which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 4 has been amended to recite that the oscillation circuit is stopped while the clock-control signal is in the disable-state. Accordingly, power consumption can be reduced while the oscillation circuit is stopped, thus overcoming the problems of the prior art in which power consumption of the master oscillator is large. Clearly, the AAPA fails to disclose such features and thus fails to anticipate the present invention as claimed. Therefore, Applicants' respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner and that the allowance of independent claim 4 be so indicated.

With respect to the rejections of claims 1-3 under U.S.C. 103(a) set forth on pages 3-5 of the Office Action as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of several secondary references, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claims 1-3 have been cancelled in their entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, further discussion with respect to the merits of such rejection are no longer believed to be warranted.

Further, with reference to page 5 of the Office Action, claims 5-7 have been rejected under under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). As noted above, Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and contend that the AAPA neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by the Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, AAPA does not disclose an oscillation circuit which generates a clock signal for data transmission upon receiving an operation-enable signal as recited in independent claim 4. Accordingly, in that each of claims 5-7 directly depend from independent claim 4 and include all of the limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that these claims likewise distinguish over the AAPA and are in condition for allowance. Moreover, dependent claim 5 has been amended to recite the detection of the change of the control signal on the basis of the output signal of the delay gate and the output signal of the first flip-flop.

With respect to the rejection of claim 8 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,087 issued to Dehghan, this rejection is likewise respectfully traversed in that the patent to Dehghan fails to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the AAPA.

Again, Applicants contend that the AAPA neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by the Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, AAPA does not disclose an oscillation circuit which generates a clock signal for data transmission upon receiving an operation-enable signal. While the patent to Dehghan may disclose using noise removal circuitry in signal detection, this reference fails to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the AAPA and does not disclose or suggest including an oscillation circuit which generates a clock signal for data transmission upon receiving an operation-enable signal. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 likewise distinguishes over the AAPA when taken alone of in view of the teachings of Dehghan and is in proper condition for allowance.

With respect to new dependent claim 9, this claim has been added to further define that which Applicants' regard as the invention. In that his claims is indirectly dependent on independent claim 4 and includes all of the limitations thereof, this claim is likewise believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Correspondingly, the entry, consideration and allowance of new claim 9 is also respectfully requested.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 4-9 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000